Construction of Elevated Corridors from Minerva Circle to Hudson Circle and loop flyover from existing Bala Gangadhara Nath Swamiji Flyover to Town Hall, and Elevated Corridors from Sangolli Rayanna Circle (Anandrao Flyover) to Nrupathunga Road (KR Circle) in Bengaluru City (Length - 7 KM) using Ultra High-Performance Fiber Reinforced Concrete (UHPFRC) under Engineering, Procurement & Construction (EPC) Mode on Lumpsum, Turkey with allowable Price Escalation based structures including Maintenance for a period of 10 years.

Query raised by: M/s Uppar & Sons

Sl.No	Document (RFP/DCA/etc)	Bidders Comment / Clarification Requested	Response
1	Qualification Criteria	Issue 1-Type of Similar Work: Clause 3.3(c)(iv) lists eligible similar works as "Construction of Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover qualification uses the terminology "Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover". Irrigation works involving Aqueducts and Irrigation structures are not expressly listed, despite being structurally and technically equivalent.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
2	Qualification Criteria	(d) Issue 2-Bridge & Structure Component within a Larger Irrigation Work: Where a contractor has executed a large integrated irrigation project (e.g., ₹1,000 Crores), the bridges and structures component within that project may by itself exceed the 20% threshold of ₹111.45 Crores. The current criteria do not expressly clarify whether such a component - being an identified, certifiable and discrete subset of a larger project can be presented as the qualifying 'single similar work' for the Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover condition. Clarification and amendment is requested.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
3	Qualification Criteria	e) Issue 3-Interpretation of 'Length' for Multi-Structure Projects: The tender requires the similar work to have "length atleast 20% of the length of the elevated corridor" i.e. ≥ 1.4 km. For a single continuous flyover this is straightforward. However, for an irrigation canal project comprising numerous discrete structures (Aqueducts, Bridges, Super Passages etc.) spread across a long canal alignment, it is not clear whether 'length' refers to (a) the overall canal project alignment length, or (b) the aggregate length of all bridge/structures within the project. Clarification and amendment is requested on this point.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.

Project Engineer-04
B-SMILE

Chief Engineer
B-SMILE

Director (Technical)
B-SMILE

Sl.No	Document (RFP/DCA/etc)	Bidders Comment / Clarification Requested	Response
4	Technical justification	Structural Equivalence of Aqueducts: An Aqueduct is an bridge-type structure designed to carry an irrigation canal or water channel across a road, valley, drain or other obstruction. It consists of the same fundamental structural elements as a flyover or elevated corridor pile/well foundations, RCC/PSC piers, deck slabs, multi-span continuous construction - making it directly equivalent from a structural design and construction standpoint.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
5	Technical justification	More Stringent Loading than a Flyover: Unlike road flyovers which carry intermittent vehicular loads, an Aqueduct carries a permanent, continuous hydrostatic load throughout its serviceable life. This is a structurally more demanding condition, requiring higher standards of waterproofing, crack-width control, structural durability and long-term performance demonstrating a level of technical competence that equals or exceeds that required for standard flyover/bridge construction.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
6	Technical justification	3. Identical Construction Methodology: Aqueduct construction requires the same specialized techniques as elevated corridor projects - staged concreting, post-tensioning/pre-stressing, formwork and falsework at height, precision alignment, PSC/RCC trough and deck construction, and structural waterproofing all directly transferable to the proposed UHPFRC elevated corridor project.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
7	Technical justification	4. Irrigation Already Recognized in Core Sector (Clause 3.4.3.2): The tender document at Clause 3.4.3.2 already expressly recognizes 'irrigation' as part of the core sector for Technical Capacity evaluation. It is therefore consistent and equitable that bridge-type structures within irrigation projects - specifically Aqueducts/Irrigation Structures should also be recognized as similar works for the Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover additional qualification requirement.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.

Project Engineer-04
B-SMILE

Chief Engineer
B-SMILE

Director (Technical)
B-SMILE

Sl.No	Document (RFP/DCA/etc)	Bidders Comment / Clarification Requested	Response
8	Technical justification	Bridge & Structure Component as Qualifying Subset - Intent of the Criterion: The purpose of the 'single similar work ≥ 20% of EPC' condition (i.c., ≥ ₹111.45 Crores) is to ensure that the bidder has demonstrated experience in constructing a meaningful quantum of bridge/Irrigation structure work. Where a bidder has executed an irrigation project of ₹1,000 Crores in which the bridges and irrigation structures component alone exceeds ₹115 Crores duly certified by the Engineer-in-Charge the intent of this criterion is fully and demonstrably satisfied. The bridges/structures component is a discrete, identifiable and certifiable subset of the project, executed with the same specialised skills and resources required for the proposed elevated corridor. Requiring such a component to have been awarded as a stand-alone contract would be an unduly narrow interpretation that defeats the purpose of the criterion and inadvertently disqualifies contractors with demonstrated, large-scale bridge construction experience within integrated infrastructure projects.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
9	Technical justification	Aggregate Structure Length is the Correct Measure for Multi-Structure Projects: The purpose of the "length" criterion is to ensure that the qualifying bidder has demonstrated the ability to construct a sufficient quantum of bridge-type structure i.e., the cumulative construction volume and complexity, not merely a single continuous corridor. For a project comprising numerous structures (Aqueducts, Bridges, Super Passages, Under Tunnels etc.), the aggregate length of all such structures is the appropriate and meaningful measure.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
10	Technical justification	Single Continuous Corridor vs. Multi-Structure Project Complexity is Higher: A project involving numerous individual structures across a canal alignment is in fact a more complex and challenging undertaking than a single continuous 1.4 km flyover, as it requires repeated mobilization of specialized equipment, repeated staging and post-tensioning operations, and management of structural interfaces with the canal at multiple points. Restricting the 'length' measure to a single contiguous structure would inadvertently penalize contractors with greater demonstrated experience and complexity of execution.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
11	Technical justification	Established Precedent: Various Central and State Government departments including NHAI, Karnataka PWD, and Irrigation/Water Resources Departments have in numerous EPC/BOT tenders recognized Aqueducts and Canal Bridges/structures as equivalent to Major Bridges/ROBs/Flyovers, and have accepted aggregate structure length as the measure of length for multi-structure projects. Adoption of the same position here is technically sound and consistent with standard practice.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.

Project Engineer-04
B-SMILE

Chief Engineer
B-SMILE

Director (Technical)
B-SMILE

Sl.No	Document (RFP/DCA/etc)	Bidders Comment / Clarification Requested	Response
12	Technical justification	9. No Dilution of Qualification Standard: The proposed interpretation and amendment do not in any manner dilute the qualification standard. All quantitative thresholds project cost≥₹ 111.45 Crores(20% of EPC), aggregate structure length ≥ 1.4 km (20% of 7 km), and span requirement - are fully demonstrable from our projects. The amendment only ensures that the type-description of the qualifying work is not artificially restricted to exclude technically equivalent experience.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
13	Specific Amendments Requested	Amendment 1 Clause 3.3(c)(iv) & Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover Additional Qualification Clause: After "similar Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover project" wherever appearing, add "or Aqueduct/Canal Bridge/ Irrigation Structure in an Irrigation Project" so that structures in government irrigation contracts are recognized as equivalent similar experience.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
14	Specific Amendments Requested	Amendment/Clarification 2 - Bridge & Structure Component within Larger Irrigation Work: Add a clarification that where a bidder has executed an integrated irrigation project in which the bridges and irrigation structures component (Aqueducts, Bridges, Super Passages and Irrigation structures), duly certified by the Engineer-in-Charge, has a value of ≥ 20% of the Estimated Project Cost (i.c.,≥ 2111.45 Crores), such component shall be treated as qualifying experience for the purpose of the 'single similar Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover condition, without requiring the bridges/structures to have been awarded as a separate stand-alone contract.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.
15	Specific Amendments Requested	Amendment / Clarification 3 'Length' Criterion for Multi-Structure Projects: Add a clarification that for projects comprising multiple discrete bridge/structures (such as irrigation canal projects with Aqueducts, Bridges, Super Passages etc.), the 'length' criterion shall be satisfied by the aggregate length of all irrigation/bridge structures within the project, and shall not require a single contiguous structure of the prescribed length.	RFP recognises your experience in irrigation works as civil engineering works and hence they are included under technical capacity calculation under clause 3.4.3.1 of the RFP. However, this clause is not the substitute for Eligible projects under similar nature works which are basically Major Bridge/ROB/Flyover projects. Hence, tender conditions prevail.

Project Engineer-04
B-SMILE

Chief Engineer
B-SMILE

Director (Technical)
B-SMILE